

We will be forced to recommit ourselves to a different philosophy of government if we want to live in a free society. Perpetuating a bankrupt welfare state requires more and more authoritarianism with no chance of paying the bills and with a continuing erosion of our standard of living. The looming financial crisis will not quietly go away.

Soviet socialism disintegrated after years of poor economic conditions and a tyrannical government. We need not put ourselves through that. The duration of a diminishing standard of living and a growing police state could go on for a long time if we do not recommit ourselves to the fundamental principles upon which freedom depends. If the prevailing principle that now is generally accepted by the majority in the U.S. Congress is not challenged, reversal of today's trend is impossible.

The prevailing moral principle of the 20th century that stole the revolution is simply: The government has been granted the arbitrary use of force to bring about social and economic changes.

Knowing the full meaning of this reveals a monstrous notion. It is this idea that permits today's programs of taxing, spending, regulating, confiscating, militarizing, harassing, policing, instructing, controlling, borrowing, inflating, moralizing, and meddling, while integrating government into every aspect of our lives; all done, of course, in the name of doing good. If the founders of this country are watching, they are surely embarrassed. What they fought for we have frittered away.

I am optimistic, though, enough to believe that most Americans truly want to live in a free society. The numbers are rapidly growing, especially since the handwriting is on the wall and the government largesse is coming to an end. The message of liberty appeals especially to the younger generations, since they increasingly see themselves as the victims of a bankrupt welfare state that may smoulder for a long time.

What principle must we accept if the welfare principle is to be replaced? The same one the founders followed in writing the Constitution: The Government does not have the moral authority to use force to mold society or the economy, nor does any person have this authority.

Government's role is to restrain force when individuals violate the rights of others, which means no robbing or killing and breaking of one's contract. Molding behavior and regulating the economy, even if well-motivated, are not permissible in a free society. The problem with the idea that a little socialism or a little welfare is needed is that once the moral principle upon which welfare depends is conceded to any degree, there is no moral argument for limitations. Politicians trading votes and lobbyists earning a top-notch living will then determine the limits. Limitations will only come when the

funds disappear, precipitating anger, frustration, and sacrifice of personal liberty.

It has been said that the art of politics is compromise, and on the important issues, bipartisanship is crucial. If one group wants \$30 billion for a welfare program and the other wants \$20 billion, both will settle for \$25 billion. That is no compromise, that is a total victory for those who endorse force and taxation to redistribute wealth. Those arguing for less achieve nothing because they concede the authority to the State to rob Peter to pay Paul. Yes, a little less, but so what. If we come up short before the fiscal year end, a supplemental appropriation will pass to make up the difference. That is compromise?

Compromise has a good name, but there are and must be political absolutes regarding the role for government. Otherwise there are no limits to spending and deficits. Some argue there are only gray areas in politics, and only compromise will permit workable solutions. Surely there should be no compromise on murder, theft, and fraud. These should be either illegal or not.

The promoters of welfare endlessly use the compromise argument to soften the opposition. Compromise sounds so gentlemanly and compassionate. In reality, those arguing for slightly less have conceded the entire argument to the welfarists that government has the authority in the first place to promote forced redistribution. Right and wrong should be argued, just as right and wrong are argued on murder and theft.

The record is clear that the compromise approach has been very successful for the welfare state. The spending is endless and deficits persist, while demands continue to grow.

Simply put, government, even through congressional legislation, has no moral right to steal. It is wrong and the Constitution prohibits it. Compromise with welfare proposals will be no more successful than the Missouri Compromise was in solving the slavery question.

A society that condones government violence and forced redistribution of wealth while attacking the right of its citizens to defend themselves against violence must by its very nature accept authoritarianism as a way of life. This will lead to severe unwanted violence on a grand scale, since the use of violence has been accepted as a proper government function. Tragically, the only defense eventually will be for the people to counter it with their own force.

The purpose of politics is simple but profound: It is to achieve liberty, unless one wants authoritarianism. Why should we have liberty? A society honoring individual liberty permits the best hope for mankind to achieve progress in all that we do. Achieving excellence, virtue, happiness, spiritual well-being, economic security, and mental satisfaction can best be accom-

plished through voluntary means, available only in a free society.

We must agree on the ground rules that the people have established with the Government. The Constitution, although now generally dismissed, provides that contract between the people and the Government. Although imperfect without the agreement, and that is essentially what we have today, we see the anarchy of special interest government in a desperate effort to satisfy their demand as bankruptcy draws near. Street muggings to transfer wealth are morally comparable to an IRS mugging used to separate a citizen from his hard-earned cash. Splitting the difference on an appropriations bill will do nothing to solve our problems. It will only make them worse by perpetuating an immoral system.

The key to the Constitution working is our acceptance of the premise laid down by Jefferson: "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Rights, being natural or God-given, are the only moral alternative to the secular humanists who finds violence a proper tool to promote the authoritarian agenda through government monopoly education.

As our national bankruptcy unravels and we lose confidence in the dollar, more and more Americans want real answers to our problems. We will not find these answers in tinkering with the present system. That will only delay the inevitable and further inflate the financial bubble.

As this becomes more evident, expect more Americans to look toward liberty and away from tyranny. A growing army of Americans is once again being introduced to the principles of liberty, and they like what they see. America can remain the bastion of liberty and peace, and it need not be a painful decision. Freedom requires no sacrifice. If any suffering comes, it must be laid at the doorstep of those who have excessively spent, regulated, and taxed.

Restoring liberty, eliminating taxes, releasing our creative energy from the chains of big government bureaucrats, and permitting people to keep their earnings guarantee a prosperity and security not yet known to man. Self-respect and natural pride would follow.

The liberty bridge to the 20th century is the bridge I hope we use, not the one offered to us and built by the status quo. I plan, with many others, to work to build the liberty bridge.

A FAIR HEARING ON GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to tell a story about Guam and its quest for political dignity in the context of recent stories about fundraising, some trends in the Asian region regarding the strategic utilization of Guam and the aspirations

of the people that I so proudly represent.

In President Clinton's State of the Union Address he called on Congress to look to the East no less than to the West, and this demonstrates the growing perspective shift which is taking hold in this country recognizing the Asian Pacific region's importance to global affairs and recognizing the trend that the United States is indeed a Nation not just with interests in the Pacific but is indeed a Pacific Nation.

The United States commitment to the Asia-Pacific region provides the framework for the stable conditions which in turn promote trade and commerce. The resulting trade and commerce then provide the basis upon which there are further advancements in the peaceful relations of the region. And as the Department of Defense continues with the Quadrennial Defense Review, the QDR, it is imperative that the Department of Defense act on Secretary Cohen's belief that any force structure changes be strategy driven and not budget driven.

The future dynamics of the Asia-Pacific region require that the United States examine its role in the region. One key element of U.S. policy will be a forward deployed military presence. And in this analysis, Guam is uniquely situated to play a major role in the forward presence of this country in this vital region. Guam, as many of you know, is 9,000 miles away from here, some 1,800 miles south of Japan, approximately 4 to 5 flying hours to most parts of the Asian mainland.

The strategic uses of Guam have been heightened recently. There is this week, I believe tomorrow Guam time, arriving on Guam the USS *Independence*, which is a carrier home ported in Japan, and it marks the first time that a carrier has visited Guam in over 30 years. This highlights our strategic importance in supporting the 7th fleet as well as the mobility of the 7th fleet. I believe it also sends a message to the entire Pacific region about Guam's role in that and also the general mobility of American forces.

Guam is also being studied in the context of some Marine Corps activities in line. Considering some of the problems that the Marines have in Okinawa, there is serious consideration today of perhaps deploying a unit of marines on Guam.

This general strategic use of Guam is entirely in concert with its geographical location, but much more important than that, I believe, is its relationship to this country as an American territory. One of the reasons why it becomes vital to the overall deployment of forces in Asia is because if securing base rights in other countries and Southeast Asia or perhaps even Australia prove difficult or undesirable or problematic in some way, Guam, as an American territory, provides basing opportunities within the region. And also, because of its status as an American territory, it was of enormous

value in the placement of Kurdish refugees during Operation Pacific Haven dealing with the Kurds that came out of northern Iraq, and also in fact during the air strikes in Iraq itself. Air Force B-52 bombers landed on Guam prior to continuing their mission in the Persian Gulf. This was facilitated by the fact that there were no air space requirements that had to be dealt with.

Admiral Prueher, the U.S. Commander in Chief of the Pacific, CINCPAC, uses the term "cooperative engagement" to describe United States strategy in the Asia Pacific region. The three-part strategy includes peacetime involvement, crisis response, and maintaining fighting ability. All of these elements can be accomplished with Guam as a partner in this strategic initiative.

I think it is important, in line with this cooperative engagement theme, that it is important now, I think, for the Federal Government to ensure some cooperative engagement with Guam in its aspirations for greater political autonomy. We need to do this in order, I believe, to continue to count on Guam as an important part of America's forward deployed forces and to fulfill its security role.

The Federal Government must also address the political aspirations of the people of Guam as well as some of their economic concerns. One of the main items that is of importance to the people of Guam is that land no longer needed by the U.S. military should be returned to Guam. And by most estimates, including the military's own estimates, the acreage, the amount of acreage held by the military is roughly double that which they really need to use, even in the severest contingency.

In addition, the legitimate political aspirations of the people of Guam are connected to the military utilization of the island. After all, the U.S. presence on Guam is not an accident of history but a result of the island's strategic location. To the extent that military planners can see a connection between forward deployment and the democratization of the Asian region, we must also be able to envision how it would work in microcosm form on a small island within the American family.

The pursuit of commonwealth status remains the single most important political issue for the people of Guam. The Draft Guam Commonwealth Act clarifies and strengthens the relationship with the Federal Government, places the island on a full path to full self-government, and frees the island from many Federal restraints on our economic development. For almost 100 years since Guam became a possession of the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War, the people of Guam have been waiting for the full measure of rights guaranteed to other American citizens. Our current status is unsatisfactory, and we are seeking an improved relationship which we believe will be mutually beneficial to both Guam and the Federal Government.

Since 1987, the leadership of Guam, through the Guam Commission on Self-Determination and the Office of the Guam Delegate to the U.S. House, have been engaged in the pursuit of commonwealth for Guam. On numerous occasions I have spoken on the House floor to try to tell the Guam story and to explain what Guam wants in our quest for commonwealth.

One of the most important provisions of the Guam Commonwealth Act is the mutual consent provision. What this means is that we are hoping that once the Federal territorial negotiations are completed, the provisions of the act would not be changed by either the Federal Government or the Government of Guam without some mutual action. This is a key element in the act because I believe that it symbolizes the ability of the people of Guam to govern themselves rather than be governed from afar.

In addition, the Guam Commonwealth Act would create a joint commission on U.S. and Commonwealth of Guam relations. This joint commission would be used for regular consultations and will be central to the maintenance of the commonwealth. It ensures that the integrity of this special relationship between the United States and Guam will be protected and respected.

These provisions raise constitutional issues in the minds of many, and we on Guam recognize this. But if we are to perfect the meaning of American citizenship for people who are not, who do not and realistically cannot have the aspirations for statehood, we must push the envelope, think outside the box and engage these issues in a meaningful way.

Another crucial element of the draft commonwealth proposal is Guam's desire to control its own immigration. It is the historical and contemporary application of U.S. immigration standards to Guam which drives our need to modify and manage the flow of people who migrate to Guam to make either their voluntary residence or their place of employment.

This brings me to what is clearly a painful and uncomfortable topic, and that is recent media reports linking the Clinton administration position on commonwealth and campaign contributions by people of Guam to the Democratic Party. What disappoints me most about these reports is how they have blurred the lines between Guam's contributions and foreign contributions. Guam has been a U.S. territory since 1898, and its residents have been citizens since 1950. To include Guam in lists of foreign countries allegedly making campaign contributions is not only misleading, it reveals a lack of understanding about Guam's participation as an American community.

These are contributions by fellow Americans, not foreigners. Last week the Los Angeles Times quoted a Member of the other body as saying, "Allegations have been made about Cuba, Indonesia, even Guam. And this is the

first time since we reformed campaign financing 23 years ago that there's been allegations of foreign involvement in American political campaigns."

Clearly, this Member is making Guam out to be a foreign contributor instead of the active American community that we are. I wonder what the people of his home State would have thought if that Member had spoken of allegations made about Cuba, Indonesia and even Arizona.

It is important to make this distinction between foreign contributions and American contributions in the context of these discussions because it seems that it rubs Guam in a negative way in both directions.

To the extent that the people of Guam cannot vote for President of the United States, the one way that perhaps they can provide evidence of their support for the candidacy of an individual running for President is to make a campaign donation. And now that very campaign donation has many doubts cast upon it, and its utility has been besmirched and run through the media mud.

These reports have also failed to point out that the President committed to appointing a special White House representative and moving forward with the commonwealth negotiations during a meeting that I participated in in 1993, and in which I made a request for the President and in which he agreed that he would appoint a special negotiator. This was well before any campaign contributions were made. To link this process to political contributions delegitimizes the very legitimate efforts of the people of Guam to attain a fuller measure of political dignity through a commonwealth.

The article printed in the Washington Post last week alleged a quid pro quo policy shift based on campaign contributions from the people of Guam. The quid pro quo alleged by the article simply has not occurred.

While there have been serious discussions with the administration since 1993, about Guam's quest for commonwealth, to date there has been no specific policy shift. What has changed is the context in which our desires for the local control of immigration have been portrayed. This distortion has been suggested by members of the Federal bureaucracy whom we from Guam are very familiar with because we have negotiated rather unsuccessfully with them over the years.

It is also important to note that, when we look at it in terms of from Guam, we are wondering how we are portrayed in the national media. I heard in the radio this morning a reporter for one of the national magazines making again the claim, and this has been repeated in a number of media interviews, that our policy toward Guam had shifted as a result of campaign negotiations.

It is the extension of the meaning of the word "our" and the portrayal of the people of Guam as being foreign,

out there. I doubt if our policy toward Arizona or our policy toward Montana would be portrayed in that way because the pronoun our is used in that context in the terms of foreign policy. It seems that certainly to the people of Guam that for military purposes we are treated very domestically. But apparently for fundraising purposes, we are quite foreign.

The type of immigration control that Guam desires is not unusual in the context of territorial relations. In the past the National Government has designated territorial leaders to issue passports and administer other functions normally reserved for Federal agencies, and these are parts of the organic acts or the organizing acts for many territories.

Today two territories control immigration locally, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. Our desire for immigration control is also consistent, we believe, with the national trend toward the shift of power from the National Government to local government. We on Guam strongly support and even accept and support existing U.S. statutes with respect to fair labor standards, the protection of workers rights, safety and health, and the U.S. minimum wage system. They have become inherent in the way we operate daily in our offices, in our businesses, in our commercial enterprises on Guam. What we seek is economic relief through the ability to procure workers on a temporary basis while continuing to administer these standards ourselves and not their abandonment, as some would suggest.

□ 1700

We also want to rectify the negative social impact caused by existing Federal immigration law. Guam proposes a standard-driven process whereby the government of Guam will earn the gradual assumption of control congruent with its direct administration of these standards. This has been the tenets of the process of negotiation that we have had with the administration, not the kind of farfetched portrayal that has been made in the media.

What allegedly goes on in other areas is not the desire of the people of Guam. We are not only mindful of the accusation of labor abuses elsewhere in the Pacific region, we too are greatly concerned about them. What the leaders of Guam hear most is not the sound of money changing hands, but the cries and the aspirations of the people about serious policy concerns.

Guam contributes enormously to the strength of our country and Asia and we deserve to be heard on the merits of our arguments. The extension of democracy should have no price.

America's rationale for a strong defense is not only to provide security but to provide the basis to increase the democratization of the Asian Pacific region. If the Federal Government is not willing to deal with Guam's concerns, this rationale is made empty and

degraded. If the United States is to increase and stand for democracy in Asia, it must start at home and even when that home is some 9,000 miles away from Washington.

The call of the people of Guam is a call to open-mindedness. We call on the administration to continue the negotiations to their final conclusion and we ask this Congress to give the people of Guam a fair hearing. We not only desire it, we deserve it, and for the past 100 years, in reality, this is all that we have been asking for.

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF UNITED STATES AND GOVERNMENT OF UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 105-47)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Supplementary Agreement Amending the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Social Security (the Supplementary Agreement), which consists of two separate instruments: a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The Supplementary Agreement, signed at London on June 6, 1996, is intended to modify certain provisions of the original United States-United Kingdom Social Security Agreement signed at London February 13, 1984.

The United States-United Kingdom Social Security Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements with Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the U.S. and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Supplementary Agreement, which would amend the 1984 Agreement to update and clarify several of its provisions, is necessitated by changes that have occurred in U.S. and English law in recent years. Among other things, the Supplementary Agreement removes certain restrictions in the original agreement concerning payment of